

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/660,444	09/12/2000	Keiichi Iwamura	35.C14834	6601	
5514	7590 04/21/2005	EXAMINER			
	CK CELLA HARPER (ELLER PLAZA	EDWARDS,	EDWARDS, PATRICK L		
NEW YORK			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			2621	" '	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/660,444	09/660,444 IWAMI		IURA, KEIICHI		
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Patrick L Ed	dwards	2621			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	lress		
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reploperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no ever ply within the statut I will apply and will te, cause the applic	at, however, may a reply be tin ory minimum of thirty (30) day expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ation to become ABANDONE	mely filed /s will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this con ID (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status			·		•		
1)⊠ 2a)□ 3)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)[Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-22 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. 						
Applicat	ion Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examina The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examina to the specific product of the specific p	ccepted or b)[e drawing(s) be ction is require	e held in abeyance. Se d if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). pjected to. See 37 CF			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have beer nts have beer ority docume au (PCT Rule	n received. n received in Applicat nts have been receiv nt.2(a)).	tion No ed in this National S	Stage		
2) Notion 1	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date	-	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 8 6) Other:	y (PTO-413) Date Patent Application (PTO	-152)		

Application/Control Number: 09/660,444

Art Unit: 2621

Page 2

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submissions filed on 12-21-2004 and 1-21-2005 have been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. The applicant's arguments, filed on 12-21-2004, have been fully considered. A response to these arguments is provided below.

35 USC 112, Second Paragraph Rejections

Summary of Argument:

Claims 1-4, 7-9, 13-15, 17, and 19 were previously rejected under § 112(2) as being indefinite. Applicant submits that the amendment to the claims has corrected all the previous 112(2) issues.

Examiner's Response:

The examiner agrees. The previous rejection is hereby withdrawn. Applicant's amendment, however, has caused one new 112(2) problem which will be given in the below rejection.

Prior Art Rejections

Summary of Argument:

Applicant has amended the claims and argues that the additional limitations have overcome the prior art rejections from the previous office action.

Examiner's Response:

The previous rejections are now moot. A new grounds for rejection is provided below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 4. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2621

With regard to claim 3, the claim recites that the compressing means comprises second embedding means. It is not clear how or why the second embedding means would be a part of the compressing means, and not a separate entity in and of itself. The examiner suspects that this claim simply requires re-wording. However, if the claim is worded correctly, then appropriate clarification and explanation is respectfully requested. For further examination purposes this claim will be interpreted as the same "second embedding means" which is described in claim 13, since it appears that the claim is mis-worded as currently written.

Claim 4 is rejected because it depends from an indefinite claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

 (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 6. Claims 1-4, and 8-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Adler et al (USPN 6,275,599).

With respect to claim 1, which is representative of claim 8, Adler discloses inputting an original image which is constructed of a plurality of bit planes (Adler col. 3 line 63 – col. 4 line 1).

Adler further discloses compressing at least a first predetermined bit plane of the original image data to form compression data (Adler col. 6 lines 32-67: The reference describes computing a 'reduced data set' (i.e. compression data)).

Adler further discloses embedding the compression data into the first predetermined bit plane of the original image (Adler col. 7 lines 28-37: The reference describes embedding this compression data back into the original image. The reference further discloses that this data is embedded back into the original image at original predetermined bit plane (Adler col. 4 lines 1-3)).

With respect to claim 2, the first predetermined bit plane from the Adler reference (as discussed immediately above) is a lower bit plane (Adler col. 4 lines 1-3: The reference describes "least significant numbers" (i.e. lower bit plane)).

With respect to claim 3, Adler discloses embedding additional information into the second predetermined bit plane or the original image (Adler col. 7 lines 17-27: The reference describes embedding additional

Art Unit: 2621

information (i.e. owners name, time, etc.) into a second predetermined bit plane of the original image (i.e. the 104 spare bits).

With respect to claim 4, Adler discloses the possibility that the additional information can be embedded in a most significant number (i.e. upper bit plane) (Adler col. 4 lines 3-5).

With respect to claim 21, Adler discloses an invisible watermark (Adler col. 4 lines 1-2).

With respect to claim 10, which is representative of claim 16, all of the limitations except one have been discussed above. The additional limitation that the compression data is not just a compression of a first predetermined bit plane, but rather is a compression of both a first predetermined bit plane and a second predetermined bit plane is further disclosed in Adler. As was stated above, Adler discloses that the embedded watermark is a modification of all or part of the least significant numbers (Adler col. 4 lines 1-3). Since this term is pluralized, we can conclude that the compression is performed on at least two predetermined bit planes.

With respect to claim 22, Adler discloses both an invisible watermark and an "image dependent" (i.e. visible) watermark (Adler col. 4 lines 1-7).

With respect to claim 13, which is representative of claim 17, all of the limitations of the claim have been discussed above except for the additional limitation of "encrypting data showing a result of the compression in said compressing means." Adler discloses this encryption step (Adler col. 4 lines 5-7).

With respect to claims 11 and 14, Adler discloses holding information representing the first predetermined bit plane, as key information (Adler col. 5 lines 18-23: The references describes the key information. It follows that the reference inherently discloses a holding means for holding this key information, since it inherently has to be stored (held) somewhere.

With respect to claim 12, 15, and 20, Adler discloses reversible compression (Adler col. 5 lines 50-59).

With respect to claims 9, 18, and 19, Adler inherently discloses a memory for storing a computer executable program which performs a method (Adler col. 1 line 39: The references describes the field of endeavour as "computer imaging". Thus, the reference inherenty discloses storing a program for executing the steps of a method on a computer processor.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2621

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adler as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dumoulin (USPN 6,571,020). The arguments as to the relevance of Adler as applied above are incorporated herein.

With respect to claim 7, Adler discloses a color image as an original image (Adler col. 2 line 49) but fails to expressly disclose that this color image is an RGB image. Dumoulin, however, discloses an RGB image (Dumouline col. 6 lines 13-23). It would have been obvious to one reasonably skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Adler to include RGB images as taught by Dumoulin. Such a modification would have allowed for the use of an image color format which is displayed on most computer monitors.

Conclusion

- 9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- Kawaguchi et al. (USPN 6,473,516) discloses embedding data at predetermined bit planes of an image.
- 10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick L Edwards whose telephone number is (703) 305-6301. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am 5:00pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Boudreau can be reached on (703) 305-4706. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patrick L Edwards

WIM

Art Unit 2621

ple

ANDREW W. JOHNS
PRIMARY EXAMINED